

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 1/4/2010.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 1/4/2010, Claims 1-2, 5, 8-11, 13-14, 17, and 21-22 were amended and claims 23 and 24 were added as new. This action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheung et al. ("Cheung" US 7523937).

In respect to independent claim 1, Cheung teaches a method comprising:
registering an alarm event in an electronic device in response to an alarm signal for an event, said alarm signal being output by said device according to a predetermined setting of said device; (See Figure 4 and Abstract) storing the registered alarm event in

Art Unit: 2174

a list in a storage of the device; and presenting at least a portion of the list of registered alarm events to a user of the device. (See Figures 5a and 4, and Abstract)

As per claim 2, Cheung teaches the method according to claim 1, further comprising: receiving an input to the device, said input being associated with said alarm event: determining status of the alarm event based on the input, said status being indicative if the alarm signal for the event is to be repeated in the future; wherein the storing of the registered alarm event in a list further comprises: storing a current status the registered alarm event, and -status of future alarms for the event, if any, in the list. (Please see Figure 5a which gives the user an option dismiss an alarm or to "snooze" it)

As per claim 3, Cheung teaches allowing a user to edit said list (See Abstract).

As per claim 4, Cheung teaches editing said list via an input device of the device (See Figure 1).

As per claim 5, Cheung teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the alarm signal is an audio sound output via a speaker of the device. (See Figure 6, Element 214)

As per claim 6, Cheung teaches that the list of alarm events is presented to a device user via a display of the device (Figure 1, element 47).

As per claim 7, Cheung teaches transferring the list of events from the device via a cable or wireless connection to a receiving means (Column 4, Line 62 – Column 5 Line 11).

As per claim 9, Cheung teaches a computer-readable medium having a computer program stored thereon, said computer program comprising computer

Art Unit: 2174

executable components for causing a device to perform the method of claim 1 when the computer-executable components are run on a microprocessor included in the device (Figure 1).

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11-16 are similar in scope to claims 2-7 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to combination of claims 10 and 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, Cheung teaches the system according to claim 18, wherein the first device is further arranged to transfer the list of events via a cable or a wireless connection to said second device.(See Figure 1, remote computer)

As per claim 20, Cheung teaches that the second device is arranged with a display via which the list of alarm events is presented to a user of the second device, and which second device is further arranged with an input device via which the user can edit the list (See Figure 1, a remote computer can send the data to a local computer which then displays it).

As per claim 21, Cheung teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the input to the device is a stop signal or a snooze signal, and wherein determining if the alarm signal for the event is to be repeated comprising determining the alarm signal is to be stopped and repeated later if the input is a snooze signal, and the alarm signal is to be stopped

Art Unit: 2174

and not to be repeated later if the input is a stop signal, and wherein stopped or snoozed by said user are shown in said list and are editable by said user (See Figure 7 and accompanying text).

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 21; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, Cheung teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said registered alarm event is stored in the list with one or more of the following attributes: activation, stopping, snoozing, time of stopping, time of snoozing, time of reoccurrence, frequency of reoccurrence, time of activation, and previously set time of activation. (See Figure 7 where the user is able to set the attributes of the alarm).

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 23; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2174

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 8, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Cheung in view of Yach et al. (US 2002/0128036).

As per claim 8, Cheung does not teach that the alarm signal is a vibration pattern output via a vibrator of the device. Yach teaches, "There are several ways to notify the user before the event is reached including but not limited to: running a vibrator, blinking a light, sounding an alarm, popping up a notification box on the screen or some combination of the above. The user can select the amount of time before the event takes place before starting the alarm, the user can also select the alarm method, i.e. vibration, beeping or a combination of the two." (Paragraph 0091). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cheung with the teachings of Yach and include a vibratory alarm with the motivation to provide the user with an alarm that is able to obtain attention with greater effectiveness.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-

Art Unit: 2174

4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571)272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174